

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
March 27, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (RSWG) on March 27, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment 1 | Meeting Agenda |
| Attachment 2 | Meeting Attendees |
| Attachment 3 | Flip Chart Notes |
| Attachment 4 | Riverbend Park Update |
| Attachment 5 | Riverbend Park Preferred Master Plan |
| Attachment 6 | Resource Goals – Oroville Facilities Relicensing |

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the RSWG meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes of the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – February 27, 2003 RSWG Meeting

A summary of the February 27, 2003 RSWG meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- Action Item #R58:** Provide status of property “give-aways” to Native American tribes, specifically land at Foreman Creek.
- Status: DWR is in the process of meeting with Native American tribes regarding repatriation. These are confidential government-to-government talks, discussing a non-relicensing issue and the discussion details cannot be provided to the public. Work Group participants asked whether lands in question were recreation lands, and suggested that previous transfers were in violation of the existing license. DWR repeated that it could not provide details of the discussion to the public at this time, but stated no transfers of Project 2100 land would occur without FERC approval. Any transfers of Project land described within the new license would also be subject to FERC approval.
- Action Item #R59:** Follow-up on road interim projects.
- Status: Doug Rischbieter, DWR Recreation Resource Area Manager (RAM) provided an update on three interim projects that include road improvements: improvements at the equestrian camp, the Saddle Dam trailhead, and in the shooting area. One additional project is planned at the Wilbur Road boat launch that will include improvements to the parking area, and a reconfiguration of the entrance road there.
- Action Item #R60:** Provide update on Riverbend Park.
- Status: Bob Sharkey representing the Feather River Recreation and Parks District (FRRPD) provided an update on the activities occurring at Riverbend Park. A summary handout that details the environmental review process, funding, equipment and facility purchases, and a timeline of the project was distributed to the RSWG (see Attachment 4). In addition, the design layout of the preferred master plan was

presented to the RSWG (see Attachment 5). Construction of the project is anticipated to begin in spring 2004.

Study Plan Implementation Update

Donna Plunkett with the consulting team provided an update on SP-R4 (Assess Relationship of Fish/Wildlife Management on Recreation) and SP-R5 (Assess Recreation Area Management). Donna explained that these two studies are closely related with the distinction that R4 focuses on lands managed by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and R5 focuses on lands managed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). An overlap exists between these two studies based on the fact that these two agencies perform management functions for one another (e.g., CDFG manages recreation opportunities in the Oroville Wildlife Area (OWA) and DPR writes tickets for fish/game violations).

SP-R4: Assess Relationship of Fish/Wildlife Management on Recreation

SP-R4 was started in November 2002, ahead of schedule, and is approximately 25% complete. The anticipated completion date is August 2003. A draft Interim Report is being prepared and will be submitted to DWR in the next week. This study does not entail any additional survey work beyond what is included in other studies and focuses primarily on management of the OWA because that area is directly managed by CDFG. To a lesser extent, this study also evaluates fish/wildlife management in the rest of the State Recreation Area (SRA). Donna explained that this study is currently in the research/data collection stage, which consists of first identifying the management structure in the project area and how management relates to the various legal codes and mandates, and then evaluating how fish/wildlife management affects recreation. She acknowledged that funding and interagency coordination are issues that have been identified in the context of fish/wildlife management in the project area. It was noted that land adjacent to (south of) Riverbend Park is included in the study, even though it is not in the FERC boundary; FRRPD manages these lands through an agreement with CDFG.

SP-R5: Assess Recreation Area Management

SP-R5 addresses the management of recreation areas in the project area. It focuses on lands managed by the DPR, namely the Lake Oroville State Recreation Area (LOSRA), as well as areas that DWR manages. The LOSRA designation is selected to focus on DPR's management of the project area on recreation and this study provides a historical perspective of the transfer of management of project lands from DWR to DPR. It addresses the relationship between DPR's management and other management entities in the project area, and how that interaction affects recreation. Opportunities for better coordination between management entities will be noted. The RSWG requested that this study clarify the level of authority land managers have for making decisions related to recreation in the project area and Donna confirmed that this study intends to fully describe the management structure and authorities.

Other Studies

There are no changes to previous updates on the other study plans. The RSWG discussed the review process for the report deliverables and identified four steps: (1) consulting team prepares Interim Report and provides to DWR for internal consistency review; (2) distribution for RSWG review; (3) RSWG participants provide comments to study lead; and (4) DWR/consulting team finalize report. There are no plans to re-circulate draft reports with RSWG comments, but all comments will be considered for inclusion in the final report. Individuals may contact the study lead to discuss their comments. DWR confirmed that comments could be provided at RSWG meetings and/or anytime before the final draft is complete.

One participant asked about the status of R17 (Recreation Needs Analysis). This study is scheduled for completion in September 2003. At this point, the Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement (PM&E; also now known as resource action) development process is progressing

without the information that will be provided by the needs analysis. This is causing concern for some RSWG participants because FERC will evaluate potential PM&Es based on identified needs in the project area and not based on community desires. Other participants indicated that it is appropriate for PM&Es to be developed in advance of the needs analysis, which then could be used to evaluate the entire suite of proposed PM&Es for appropriateness. It was noted that the compressed schedule doesn't allow for the typical sequence whereby studies are completed and results used to develop appropriate resource actions, however it was also noted that FERC would utilize a needs-based approach to evaluate the proposed plan. The Settlement Agreement may include items that are agreed to but were not identified in the Needs Analysis and subsequently not included in license conditions.

PM&E Discussion

A Process Task Force was established by the Plenary Group to develop three items: (1) develop a form for submitting PM&Es or resource actions; (2) develop resource action evaluation criteria; and (3) develop additional language describing the settlement negotiation process to be added to the collaborative's Process Protocol. The Facilitator noted that the Task Force completed the Resource Action Identification Form, which has been approved by the Plenary Group and then determined that the development of evaluation criteria was more appropriately accomplished in the individual work groups as they discuss proposed resource actions. The Task Force is currently working on the revisions to the Process Protocols. The Facilitator indicated that the preliminary target dates for submitting resource action identification forms are April 7 and June 16, 2003; however, these are just target dates and submittals after these dates will be considered.

The RSWG discussed the process for submitting and reviewing potential resource actions. The RSWG discussed if evaluation criteria was needed or if all resource actions should be considered and perhaps simply grouped according to priority. The JPA's representative clarified that they are collecting and organizing but not prioritizing the public's proposed resource actions. Participants agreed that any mutually agreed upon resource actions should be identified. The Facilitator clarified that three routes exist for resource actions to enter the process: submittal to an individual work group, submittal to Rick Ramirez with DWR who will distribute to the appropriate work group, or development within the work group itself as a result of discussions. Dale Hoffman-Floerke described a request from the JPA for DWR to hold a workshop to assist in the development of resource action identification forms and indicated that DWR was considering the request. If held, the meeting would be noticed to all of the collaborative participants and not held during a JPA meeting or exclusively for the JPA participants.

The RSWG discussed how resource actions could be submitted by agencies that are dependent on supporting data and agreed that placeholder resource actions could be submitted and completed once data is available. Pete Soderberg representing the JPA noted that they are approaching the process from a perspective that incorporates planning for the entire area and not individual projects. Harry Williamson representing National Park Service expressed concern that two separate, recreation-planning processes were occurring, one through the collaborative process and one through the JPA process. The JPA clarified that at one time they expected to develop a separate recreation plan for submittal to DWR but that is no longer the case and the JPA has no intention to develop or submit a separate plan. Harry noted that public agencies bound by empirical data must not be placed at a disadvantage by their inability to submit resource actions before the study results are available. DWR confirmed that more developed proposals will not enjoy an advantage. Harry expressed concerns over rising expectations because it should be clear that DWR would not be able to accommodate everything on the proposed list. The participants agreed that some proposals will have more chance of success than others and others will likely be decided at the settlement table.

The Facilitator proposed a strategy for the development and evaluation of proposed resource actions for the RSWG based on activities in other work groups. She distributed a document developed by the Environmental Work Group that consolidates the goals statements included on the issue sheets developed by each of the work groups (see Attachment 6). The RSWG discussed how other work groups are proceeding and agreed to the following approach by consensus:

The project area will be divided into geographic areas. The RSWG will discuss potential resource actions by geographic area. The following geographic areas were tentatively suggested: (1) Low-Flow Channel of the Feather River from the Fish Barrier Dam to the Afterbay Outlet; (2) Feather River below the Afterbay Outlet; (3) Oroville Wildlife Area; (4) Diversion Pool; (5) Thermalito Afterbay; (6) Thermalito Forebay; (7) Fish Barrier Pool; (8) Oroville Reservoir; and (9) upstream tributaries. DWR and the consulting team will confirm and describe the proposed areas for the RSWG. The Issue Tracker will be used as a starting point to identify potential resource actions by geographic area, augmented by additional potential resource actions collected by the JPA. A matrix will be developed to organize and describe the proposed resource actions. The RSWG discussed what column headings or 'chart toppers' should be included in the matrix and suggested the following for inclusion: Enforcement; Operation and Maintenance; Need-based; Enhancement; Change Experience/Expectation; In or Out of FERC boundary. DWR and the consulting team will prepare a matrix for at least one of the geographic regions and distribute it at the next RSWG meeting for review and comment.

The RSWG was asked to begin thinking about the best strategy for completing the evaluation of potential resource actions, including the use of task forces, longer meetings, more frequent meetings, and the use of DWR/consulting team-developed straw proposals. These approaches will be discussed at the next RSWG meeting.

Next Steps

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed on the following meeting date/time:

Date: Thursday, April 24, 2003
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM
Location: Oroville; site to be determined

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R61: Arrange for public workshop to provide guidance on completing Resource Action Information Form. Notice workshop electronically to all of the collaborative's work group distribution lists.

Responsible: DWR
Due Date: May 2003

Action Item #R62: Develop matrix for organizing PM&E proposals and identify 'chart-toppers'. Fill in matrix with proposals already identified (from SD1, Issue Tracker, JPA document) for at least one of the geographic areas.

Responsible: DWR
Due Date: April 2003

Action Item #R63: Identify appropriate meeting types, locations and durations to achieve near-term objectives for PM&E development.

Responsible: Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group participants

Due Date: April 2003